## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in the application upon entry of this amendment. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to include the features of claim 2, now canceled. No new issues requiring further search and/or consideration have been raised.

### *I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 AND 6 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)*

Claims 5 and 6 remain rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Stokes*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, an interpreter execution program *that is capable of interpreting an intermediate code* so as to generate a control command string. Applicants previously argued how *Stokes* does not teach or suggest an interpreter *which interprets intermediate code so as to generate control commands* (versus simply decrypting or encrypting data stored on the disc) which are then used for controlling the recording/reproduction of information on the optical disc as recited in claim 5. Such use of an interpreter in connection with the control command has utility as is discussed, for example, beginning on page 1, line 22 of the present application. Applicants noted it is the control commands or functions which are affected by *interpreting an intermediate code* so as to generate the control commands in the claimed invention. It is *not* simply the encryption and decryption of *data stored on the disc* as taught in *Stokes*.

In responding to Applicants' arguments, the Examiner initially points out that claim 5 reads "an execution section for executing an interpreter program that is capable of interpreting". (O.A., p. 9). The Examiner argues that this represents merely the recitation of the intended use and does not result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art.

However, applicants respectfully submit that an execution section "capable of interpreting" as recited in claim 5 *does represent a structural distinction* versus the prior art. Namely, in order for the execution section to be capable of interpreting an intermediate code, the execution section must be configured (i.e., via hardware, software, firmware, or a combination thereof) in order to perform such function. Otherwise, it is not capable of interpreting an intermediate code.

Applicants note that claim 5 does not recite "an execution section capable of being programmed to interpret ...". Rather, claim 5 recites "an execution section capable of interpreting".

The Examiner has not shown that *Stokes* is in any way configured or programmed to carry out such function so as to be capable. Absent such showing, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5 and 6 is improper and should be withdrawn for at least such reason alone.

Furthermore, the Examiner goes on to state that *Stokes* discloses an execution section for an executed program that represents an interpreter program that is capable of interpreting an intermediate code so as to generate a control command string. If applicants understand the Examiner correctly, the Examiner feels that the execution of the control program represents the interpreter function recited in claim 5.

However, a reading of the present application and the differences described on pages 7-9, for example, makes it readily clear that the "interpreting of the intermediate code" relates to decrypting of an encrypted intermediate code. In fact, claim 6 has been amended to expressly emphasize such feature of the intermediate code being encrypted.

For at least the above reasons, applicants again respectfully submit that the present invention is very different from that which is described in Stokes. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

## *II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 AND 7-11 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)*

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 remain rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) based on *Stokes*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, applicants initially point out that the claim has been amended to recite expressly that the intermediate code is encrypted. As applicants pointed out above in relation to claim 5, Stokes does not teach or suggest interpreting an intermediate code that is encrypted as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, as for the rejection of claims 1-4 and 7-11 in the previous Office Action, the Examiner argues that the applicants appeared to have misinterpreted the rejection. The Examiner points out that the rejection was based *only on Stokes*, and *not in combination with Kittirutsunetom* as alleged by applicants.

Applicants respectfully submit that it appears that the Examiner has instead misinterpreted the applicants' point. Specifically, applicants respectfully wish to point out that *the text to which the Examiner refers to in Stokes is actually referring to the teachings of Kittirutsunetom.* Therefore, while the Examiner is completely justified in arguing that the teachings of *Stokes* are to be interpreted in view of what is disclosed in *Stokes*, *what is described in Stokes is what is described in Kittirutsunetom*. (See, e.g., Stokes, Col. 1, ln. 37 to Col. 2, ln. 4, referring to the system described in *Kittirutsunetorn*).

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that they are completely entitled to refer to the teachings of *Kittirutsunetom* to clarify that *Stokes* is not teaching what the Examiner proposes.

That being said, the text in *Stokes* cited by the Examiner refers to a discussion of prior art *US 5,081,675* to *Kittirutsunetorn*. The Examiner basically relies on *Kittirutsunetorn* as teaching the RAM, ROM and CPU on a single integrated circuit. However, upon close review of Fig. 2(b) and the disclosure in column 12, lines 46-57 of

*Kittirutsunetorn*, the reference itself teaches that the CPU is not formed together with the RAM and ROM on a single integrated circuit chip. Rather, *Kittirutsunetorn* simply teaches that the PASD and RAMU may be integrally formed on the same chip. The CPU is separate and apart from the package 119 including the RAMU and the PASD.

As a result, *Kittirutsunetorn* (and similarly *Stokes*) does not teach or suggest the RAM, ROM and CPU on a single chip as recited in claim 1. *Stokes* does not add to the teachings of *Kittirutsunetorn*, but rather only describes such teachings. Thus, the teachings of Kittirutsunetom, upon which the Examiner relies through the teachings of Stokes, do not teach the invention as claimed.

On page 11 of the present Office Action the Examiner argues that although *Stokes* does not disclose the circuit of the CPU, RAM and ROM as being attached to a single piece of silicon, *Stokes* does disclose that it is known in the art that the attachment of memory and processing elements to a single piece of silicon is feasible. The Examiner therefore concludes that it would have been obvious to include everything on a single chip. Again, though, this would be contrary to the complete teachings of *Stokes* (i.e., by reference to *Kittirutsunetom*), that suggests the CPU is separate and apart from the remaining elements as noted above.

For at least such reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 6, the same arguments discussed above with respect to claim 1 similarly apply. The remaining claims may be distinguished for at least the same reasons as the claims from which the depend.

## *III. CONCLUSION*

Accordingly, all claims 1 and 3-11 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Registration No. 34,243

DATE: April 21, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113